THE NEWS PAPER LIBRARY NEWS

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

April 18, 1956

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Norway: Case History in Socialism

MAX EASTMAN

The End of Collective Bargaining?

AN EDITORIAL

The Daily Worker Finds Friends

RALPH DE TOLEDANO

Articles and Reviews by ····· C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS
FREDA UTLEY · E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN · FRANCES BECK
RUSSELL KIRK · WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM · SAM M. JONES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from WASHINGTON *straight*

A NEWSLETTER

SAM M. JONES

Judicial Hint?

Some government attorneys and other members of the legal profession believe that the Supreme Court's six-to-three decision setting aside state sedition laws may foreshadow a verdict upholding the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Court's decision overruling state laws was based on the grounds that the federal government has occupied the field of anti-subversive legislation to the exclusion of parallel action by the states, and that such laws would "conflict" with the operation of the federal plan. The Communist Party is challenging the constitutionality of the Smith Security Act. The high Court has already upheld the section making it illegal to teach and advocate overthrow of the government by force and violence.

Farm Compromise

Fast-changing plans on "what to do about the farm bill" currently center on a move virtually to rewrite the measure in conference, with something for everybody and the elimination of provisions likely to cause a Presidential veto. If this ambitious compromise founders, an alternative consideration is a motion to recommit.

Southern Thunder

Former Governor Fielding L. Wright of Mississippi, who refuses to wait for the conjectured split at the Democratic Convention, has issued a call for a Southwide third-party movement to seize control of Dixie's electoral vote and smash the "leftist dictatorship" in the national Democratic Party. Governor Wright was Strom Thurmond's running-mate on the 1948 states rights ticket.

Gray Plan Delay

For undisclosed reasons the political leadership of Virginia has permitted a slowdown in the legislative implementation of the Gray Plan recommendations. Advocates of integration and other critics charge Governor Stanley with "stalling" in failing to summon a special session of the legislature. They contend that state authorities will not be able to show satisfactory progress in compliance with the Supreme Court decision and that even if the legislature convened in May the plan would not be operative at the start of the school year. In the meantime an NAACP suit is pending in one county and further litigation is imminent in others.

Conference or Commission

Southern congressional leaders are supporting the proposal made by Florida's Governor Leroy Collins that the President invite Dixie governors and attorney generals to a White House conference on racial relations. They regard the conference idea as a welcome alternative to Mr. Eisenhower's earlier suggestion of a bipartisan racial commission with official status and the subpoena power. The NAACP opposes the Collins proposal.

Republican in Dixie

Congressman Charles R. Jonas of North Carolina, vigorous defender of one of the few GOP outposts in the South, will have tough opposition this fall in the person of Democrat Ben Douglas, three times mayor of Charlotte. Mr. Jonas, like his father before him, serves an overwhelmingly Democratic constituency. He was re-elected in 1954 and is favored by many local observers.

Itchy Neutrality

Former President Truman, who modestly deprecates his inclusion in the long list of Democratic dark horses, says he is trying hard to be neutral in the pre-Convention period. Supporters of Stevenson and Kefauver suggest that Truman's impartiality, like Nehru's, is something less than 99.44 per cent pure. Truman is, they contend, neutral for Harriman. Other Democrats who still have faint hopes for Party harmony, believe that Mr. Truman should extend his European tour far into August.

Right to Work Fight

The right to work is expected to be a major issue in many sections of the country this fall. Former Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr., co-author of the Taft-Hartley Act, and now president of the National Right to Work Committee, expects vigorous campaigns in about half the states. Right-to-work laws are now operative in eighteen states, and the issue is before the legislatures of fifteen others. Mr. Hartley has predicted union efforts to defeat pending bills and repeal existing statutes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

James Burnham Willmoore Kendall
Suzanne La Follette
Jonathan Mitchell William S. Schlamm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES AND CONTRIBUTORS

L. Brent Bozell, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, Frank S. Meyer, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Morrie Ryskind, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke
London: F. A. Voigt *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ADVERTISING MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

CONTENTS

APRIL 18, 1956 VOL. I, NO. 22

THE WEEK 3

ARTICLES

Norway: Case History in Socialism — Max Eastman 9
Letter from Taipei 11
The Daily Worker Finds Friends — Ralph de Toledano 15

DEPARTMENTS

From Washington Straight ..... Sam M. Jones 2
The Liberal Line ..... Willmoore Kendall 8
The Law of the Land ..... C. Dickerman Williams 12
Letter from the Continent — E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 13
The Third World War ..... James Burnham 14
Maryland ..... Sam M. Jones 16
From the Academy ..... Russell Kirk 17
Arts and Manners ..... William S. Schlamm 18
To the Editor 22

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Ominous Parallel ..... Freda Utley 19
Anybody's Guess ..... Richard M. Weaver 20
Still Needed ..... Anthony T. Bouscaren 20
Menacing Winds ..... Frances Beck 21
Successful Experiment ..... R.P.O. 21

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly at Orange, Conn. by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1956 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37 St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES. Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign, $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

It is significant that the suggestion that he might commit so much as a single American battalion to combat without consulting with Congress so horrified President Eisenhower that he lost his equanimity. The contrast with Mr. Roosevelt, who deployed American armed forces in utter disregard of congressional sentiment, and with Mr. Truman, who cockily committed us to a major war by the device of calling it a "police action," is refreshing. There is quite clearly in the President an instinctive respect for constitutional balance of power, which, when undeflected by the Palace Guard, hits the people with a considerable punch.

Everybody is amused by a certain kind of impiety—by cartoons that show children throwing snowballs at top hats and spattering stuffed shirts. So it's hard not to chuckle at the sight of Senator Kefauver, the overgrown child, poking his barrel-stave lance at the balloons of the solemn and mighty. At the same time, let's not overlook the fact that Estes Kefauver is the worst of the Presidential candidates. His style is less flamboyant than Huey Long's, but at the rate he is going he may set some new demagogic records before he is finished. He promises anyone anything, but beneath the mishmash of his folksy speeches there runs a dark leftward-heading current of statism at home and capitulation abroad.

Leon Jungschlaeger, a former Netherlands intelligence officer, is on trial for his life in Jakarta. Jungschlaeger is accused of plotting to overthrow the government; and the Indonesian Government is determined that the bluff Dutch sea captain shall not escape—even if he is innocent. The Lord High Executioner is Attorney General Sunarjo who, for example, arbitrarily threw out evidence which proved Jungschlaeger was in Holland while supposedly plotting rebellion in Indonesia. Jungschlaeger may pay with his life for the crime of being Dutch today in Indonesia. But it is Indonesia, not he, which will be perpetually dishonored.

To everyone's surprise, this year's Overseas Press Club awards went to these dark horses: Walter Lippmann ("best interpretation of foreign news"), Eric

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Severeid ("best radio interpretation of foreign news") and Edward R. Murrow ("best television reporting of foreign news"). Glory also came to Clifton Daniels, of the *New York Times,* Harry S. Truman's son-in-law-to-be. Messrs. Lippmann, Severeid and Murrow are becoming as dependable a winning combination as Tinker, Evers and Chance. They will stay in the Pantheon so long as they conform.

Return to States Rights

For a number of years, it has been an axiom of American political science that the issue of states rights was settled almost a hundred years ago. It follows that the principal philosopher of the losing side, John C. Calhoun, goes virtually unnoticed; for brilliant though he admittedly was, History has adjudged him a political aberrant, and History speaks with finality.

And anyway, we have been reminded, modern defenders of states rights speak with hollow voices. Their opportunism has betrayed them. They are for states rights when the federal government agitates for compliance with policies with which they disagree. But when the federal government proposes to lavish its economic charms on a particular state, resistance vanishes—even though every little states-righter knows, in his heart of hearts, that the federal government can only practice generosity on one state by exercising a very proprietary relationship indeed toward the rights of other states. When a Tennessee Valley Authority is proposed, the talk is of the Commonweal, of the Union, of the essential brotherhood of the Delta cottonpicker and the Milwaukee brewer. When the subject is a federal anti-poll-tax law, the talk is of the Great Sovereign State of Tennessee, of its Inalienable Rights and Privileges.

The Supreme Court decision of May 1954 (classifying segregated schooling as unconstitutional), because it struck hard at traditions deeply rooted and very deeply cherished, may have the effect of shaking inchoate states-righters out of their opportunistic stupor. Perhaps it is too late; but political resistance in the South seems to be centering on the broad and —potentially—dynamic concept of decentralized political authority. There has been more talk, these past few months, about the meaning of federation and about the significance of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, than there has been for a generation. The result is that many of the arguments and much of the rhetoric advanced with respect to issues besides that of segregation have taken on an immensely rejuvenating theoretical substance; so that they begin to sound, as they have not for years, reasoned, principled and consistent.

States rights figure in aspects of the fight over the federal treaty-making power. They are at issue in the Supreme Court's ruling last week that only the federal government has authority to enact anti-subversive legislation (upsetting laws in forty-one states). They are at issue in the bitterly contested question whether the federal government should have the power to regulate the price of gas at the wellhead. A congressman now suggests that the farm problem be solved by the individual states. Important struggles loom on federal aid to—and jurisdiction over—education, housing and road-building.

We believe that if there is such a thing as a mechanical safeguard to freedom, it is political decentralization. We welcome, then, the return of serious discussion of states rights; and we pray that those who today talk states rights, because of the proximate usefulness of the concept, will not toss it back to the wolves after it has served them—or failed to serve them—in a single battle. For the war is long.

Tariffs International

America's march toward Internationalism, whether by seven-league boot or by slow-shoe shuffle, never seems to slow down to a halt. At the moment, the drive is led by President Eisenhower and centers on a movement to internationalize the authority to set up tariffs.

The House Ways and Means Committee has approved U.S. participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC), and House approval of the bill is expected in the near future. Under the bill, the Organization for Trade Cooperation would take the tariff-setting authority out of the hands of Congress and give it to a 34-nation group in which the United States would have only one (1) vote, and no veto power.

President Eisenhower, insisting that membership in the OTC is basic to the success of his foreign trade program, presses for its passage, despite the fact that it will have the effect of permitting other nations to write American policy. In the expectation that the OTC will ordain reduced tariffs, high-tariff forces are spearheading the opposition.

It is regrettable that the quarrel over OTC is taking the form of the old argument over protectionism. One can most legitimately oppose, simultaneously, high tariffs *and* OTC. The question is whether the U.S. should surrender to an international body so crucial and flexible a weapon of self-protection as, in very special cases, the tariff power can be. Is not Congress' indicated support of OTC in part caused by its anxiety to strip itself of jurisdiction over a perennial political problem? Wouldn't many Congressmen be overjoyed at the prospect of turning over

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a foreign body authority over our farm problem?

Low-tariff partisans (and we are among them) should fight their battles in the open—and before an American, not an international bar.

The End of Collective Bargaining?

The five-month Westinghouse strike, probably the most costly labor dispute in our history, leaves a distinct feeling of hoplessness.

Neither the management nor the workers nor the stockholders nor the customers of Westinghouse expected a debacle on such a scale. It was never entirely clear what issues motivated so vast an action. There were, of course, practical questions of wages and benefits; but these were not rational grounds for a strike of such magnitude. We have expressed our view that, from the management side, "the right to manage" was primarily at stake: the right to decide how plant operations were to be carried on, and the right to make studies to aid in the making of such decisions. The union's behavior was, we felt, chiefly the result of Labor politics—of James B. Carey's battle to hold and improve his position within his own union (the IUE) and the AFL-CIO.

Whether or not our analysis was correct, all parties (including the general public) suffered an inordinate net loss. The final settlement was a compromise that should have been easy to reach at the beginning. Ironically, it was held up for a final month by an issue which did not even exist when the strike began—the status of strikers alleged to be guilty of violence on the picket line.

We are much troubled by this lamentable affair which, in its special frustrating quality, reminds us of the Kohler and Perfect Circle disputes. And this is the question that disturbs us:

Has our economy arrived at a point where the basis for genuine collective bargaining is dissolving?

In our huge trade unions, democratic control by the members has given way to domination by a professional bureaucracy. Bargaining no longer takes place at the plant level (where foremen and boss and workers are acquainted with each other and with actual working conditions) but on a company- or industry-wide scale (with the negotiating done by power groups remote from local realities).

The unions now have vast strike funds, replenishable from the coffers of allied unions not on strike. Some states (such as Pennsylvania in the Westinghouse strike), supplementing union funds, are prepared to step in immediately with unemployment insurance benefits. Moreover, under a "full employment" economy, as ours is at present, enterprising strikers can usually get other jobs, temporary or permanent, whenever they want them. Though many Westinghouse strikers lived below their normal level, there was no acute suffering—no going without sufficient clothes and food; no mortgages foreclosed; few cars or household goods repossessed.

Undoubtedly the absence of critical economic pressure on a striker appears to be a benevolent sign of progress. But what pressures, if not economic, are supposed to work—on both parties—to bring reconciliation? If the trend continues, to the point of virtually guranteeing to the striking worker the maintenance of his customary standard of living, what pressure is on him to go back to work? Yet who would suggest that a corporation's hand be similarly strengthened by, let us say, having the state indemnify stockholders against dividend loss, and management against salary cuts? So long as a workingman continues to receive roughly comparable income, he is not damaged. But every day the corporation's doors are closed, management and stockholders suffer irretrievable loss. Can an equation be built out of such factors? Is this "collective" bargaining?

Faced with these changes, which tend to make not only strikes but all true collective bargaining obsolescent, the development in recent years is toward a kind of Popular Front between company management and union management at the expense of stockholders and consumers. The two bureaucracies (business and labor), like the mercenary armies of the fifteenth century, carry out a formal show-battle. They end up in a treaty profitable to both. The union leaders agree to keep the work force in order. They get their union shop and their check-off of dues. The company management doesn't have to worry about labor trouble while devising juicier stock-option schemes. A joint deal is made to handle pensions, guaranteed wage, personnel and work study plans. And prices of company products are jacked up an inflationary notch or two.

The Westinghouse managers, company and union, broke with the pattern—and landed in a swamp.

Has this pattern, then, become a straitjacket which from now on our economy must endure? It could be loosened if, for example, bargaining were centered at the level of the local plant instead of the national corporation or the industry; if workers were free to decide whether or not to join a union, and if union members regained control over union officials; if management functions were excluded from the subject matter of collective bargaining; if pension funds were treated as genuine trusts, not as weapons in a power struggle; if management felt a livelier responsibility toward stockholders.

But are such conditions attainable? Could they be realized through an informed and active public

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion? If so, it is a problem of education. Or must the sanction of law be added? We do not wish to believe so. In the field of labor relations, as in most others, we are cursed with a surplus, not a scarcity, of laws. Would new laws here fasten a tighter yoke—or would they liberate the economy from a trend toward a new kind of syndicalism?

Foul

The Alabama law under which the Negro boycott leaders were convicted is, obviously, a bad law—as is any law that penalizes human beings for exercising, in legitimate fashion, their right to protest whatever laws or customs they deem offensive. And now the city of Montgomery refuses to the Negroes a franchise to operate their own bus line—on the grounds that Montgomery "cannot support two bus companies."

But Montgomery *can* support two bus companies—obviously. It could support three. What the city fathers mean to say is that Montgomery cannot have two lines for the price of one, which is true and irrelevant. We believe that the force of law ought not to be used by the federal government to force integration. And we believe that the force of law ought not to be used by the states to deprive Negroes of the right to protest, or of the right to compete with established institutions or businesses. If the Negroes wish to assume the economic burden of establishing a separate bus line, they should be allowed to do so, and the white people of Montgomery, if they have pride, should be quick to allow them to do so. By the same token, for the segregation they cherish, the white people must be prepared to pay the whole cost—twenty cents a ride, instead of ten, if need be.

Farm Stew

We have never learned just what it was the too many cooks did to spoil their broth, but it may well have been that each insisted on carrying through his own favorite recipe. So into the pot everything went, from lobster to chocolate fudge.

Such, at any rate, seems to be the approach of Congress in cooking up the farm bill that is now in conference. Name anybody's farm program, and you will find it thrown in: soil bank and soil conservation; loans and discounts; free seed and free fertilizer; storage; school lunches and foreign aid; not only high parity on every crop you can think of (except Connecticut shade-grown broad-leaf tobacco, which got left out by an accident), but also a double parity system on wheat (that is, one parity price for so many bushels, and another thereafter). They are all there, stewed together.

The result is not only indigestible but ridiculous, and nobody knows what the bill will come to. But everyone seems to agree it will not cost less than a billion and a half dollars.

Two more results are fairly certain, even while the bill is still in conference: 1) A great deal of money will be paid out to farmers before November, and 2) at this time next year the farm surplus and the farm problem in general will be in much worse shape than they are now—that means worse than very bad.

And the farm problem will go on getting worse until that problematic day when a Congress has the courage to face the fact that crops should be grown for a consuming market, not for government bureaus.

Enough Is Enough

South Carolina has become the thirty-first state to pass a resolution calling for a 25 per cent limit on federal income taxes. If one more state makes a similar demand on Congress, Congress must (under Article V of the Constitution) call a convention to consider the petition, which, having approved it, will send it back to the states in the form of a proposed constitutional amendment.

Suddenly panicked by the prospect of leaving with an individual as much as 75 per cent of his income, our resourceful planners have come up with an ingenious objection: Congress will not be compelled to act, they observe, because less than half the states that passed resolutions thought to pass them in just the form that constitutes a request for a constitutional convention. But it is not likely that the various groups which have worked seventeen years to bring about a showdown on the question will be tripped up by technicalities—the last defense of those who favor majority rule only when majority rule favors them. The fact remains that, through their state legislatures, the people—the vast majority of whom would not directly benefit from such an amendment—are saying, Enough is enough.

Gromyko's Disarming Proposal

At the current London disarmament conference, our own Harold Stassen heads the U.S. delegation. We imagine that Andrei Gromyko, leading for the Soviets, feels rather shamefaced at times: even a Communist conscience must twinge a bit at taking candy from Mr. Stassen.

On the third day, Gromyko drew a shiny new disarmament program out of his pocket. Elated by it, Mr. Stassen called in reporters, who filed stories headlined "Goes a long way toward the U.S. proposals!" "Hints Moscow may accept Open Sky plan!"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As usual in these matters, the men of Moscow are simply wiggling their bait just enough to keep the fish jumping. It is their aim to engage us in perpetual negotiation. They thus entangle us in our own toils while they, paying no attention to the substance of the discussion, go about their business—the business, that is, of conquering the world.

The hook is there, all right, under the shiners of these latest proposals. Down in a lower-case subclause we find it: no rearming of West Germany. About that, Gromyko was not fooling.

Try and Try Again

After failing to secure the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate, the proposal to alter the method of electing Presidents has had to retire for the season. It will undoubtedly be revived in the future, as it has so often been in the past.

The sponsors of the defeated proposal made a mistake in trying to patch together a compromise between the proportional representation and the local district methods. The result was a bill in which technical clumsiness obscured political issues. Those who believe that electoral reform is called for—and this seems to be a considerable majority of those who think about such things—ought to make up their minds on a single method of change, clearly stated.

We recognize the cogency of some arguments against any reform; but we were hardly swayed by the negative case that was brought to bear in the Senate. The campaign to kill the proposal was conducted by the avowedly Liberal senators of the big Eastern states. The principal negative lobbying was pushed by a coalition that included Americans for Democratic Action and the Committee for an Effective Congress, along with the CIO and a dozen other left-Liberal groups. The line-up thus confirmed the view that the present system gives undue weight to the big states and to active, well organized minority groups within them.

Education by Open Discussion

Comrade Ludmila Dubrovina, Deputy Minister of Education in the Soviet Union, recently appeared before the *New York Herald Tribune* High School Forum to contribute to an international understanding of the educational process. Here are some extracts from the address, into which she launched after extending to the foregathered multitude the warm greetings of "my great Soviet Fatherland":

"The sacred right of every person to an education," Madame Dubrovina reminded the audience, "is set down in the Constitution of our country. This right the Soviet people are enjoying to the full . . . . The system of education in the USSR is state-run and rests on a genuinely democratic basis." The design of Communist education is great. "The Soviet school system provides our pupils with a grand scope of systematic knowledge in the diverse fields of natural science, history of society and human thinking . . . . Our children grow up strong, courageous, industrious and honest. They are taught a sense of responsibility for their actions . . . They are brought up in a spirit of humanism."

There is, too, a quality of security peculiar to education in Russia, Madame Dubrovina went on, for students there "know that they will be given employment after graduation from educational establishments, since no unemployment is possible in our country."

Madame acknowledged her confidence in Communist education almost apologetically: "You may wonder what gives us this confidence in the reality of our plans and the correctness of our trend. I should say it is primarily our government's constant interest in the people's welfare, as well as the experience of several decades . . ." To be sure, "there are people . . . who refuse to recognize the cultural revolution that has swept our country. But do not they remind one of Washington Irving's personage Rip Van Winkle, who went to sleep for twenty years after drinking some beverage?"

And finally: teachers in Russia are "much loved and esteemed." Why? Because "teachers in our society are considered to be engineers of the younger generation's souls."

On the platform, listening in a posture of rapt attention, was Mr. Marion B. Folsom, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Liberal Line...

WILLMOORE KENDALL

Notes on "The Other America"

The argument about whether "the Liberals" even exist — the Liberals, that is to say, as an identifiable group with a homogeneous point of view — goes on and on. There are, the disputants on one side concede, individual "Liberals"; there are even — ADA for example — organizations made up of individual Liberals, agreed with one another on a certain number of issues, and thus able to act together for a narrow range of purposes. But the wider phenomenon that NATIONAL REVIEW keeps talking about, the Liberals qua political movement, does not exist.

Study the following highly relevant excerpt from a recent (March 1956) issue of *ADA World,* and you will see where ADA stands:

"Mrs. Foster "—and Mrs. Foster, believe it or not, is ADA's "Trips Abroad Director," which is something us conservatives don't have — "points out that . . . ADA's *unique contacts* in Europe and Israel . . . enable you to meet the people who *count* in each country, and *particularly your fellow-liberals.* They are delighted to welcome us, as ambassadors of what they call 'the other America' . . . You meet the *leaders* — but you also meet people *just like yourselves.*" (Italics mine.)

There *is,* then, "another America," and ADA is proud to think of itself as the spearhead of that other America, of ADA adepts as its ambassadors unto all nations, of "Liberal" as the right adjective to denote it. Which, of course, is just what NATIONAL REVIEW keeps saying.

One of the great bonds that tie Liberals together the world over, as this column reminds its readers now and then, is their shared skepticism about the value of local autonomies — or, if you like, of the local and private freedoms, especially when these happen to get in the way of concentration of power at the center (not any particular center; just *any* center). It is good to learn, therefore, because it helps keep things nice and symmetrical and *comme il faut,* that ADA conducts its internal business in a manner consistent with its general political philosophy. As witness the following sober account from *ADA World*:

> . . . The ADA Executive Committee discussed an invitation extended by the Swarthmore SDA chapter to Alger Hiss . . . to speak at its March 1 meeting on "The Meaning of Geneva" . . . After thorough consideration, . . . [it] requested the Swarthmore chapter to withdraw the invitation.
>
> Because it was *genuinely concerned by ADA's disapproval* of the invitation and because it *respected the opinion* of ADA's *liberal* leaders, the Swarthmore chapter agreed. [Italics mine.]

The local chapter, in other words, promptly jumped through the hoop — and also promptly decided that when the center jumps you through the hoop it forces you to be free (we are not concerned here with the merits of Hiss's being invited):

> It issued a statement saying in part: "The possibility that the ADA Executive Committee decision was in any way a violation of civil liberties or democratic organizational principles was thoroughly considered and clearly repudiated."

One of the Liberal propaganda machine's great strengths lies in its ability to use for sheer propaganda portions of our newspapers that readers think of as, by contrast with the editorials and commentaries, purely informative — a matter about which, by and large, this column has thus far had too little to say.

Take Mr. Herbert West's review of David Karp's *All Honorable Men,* in a recent Sunday *Times* book-review section. Mr. Karp's novel, he says, is the story of how a liberal educator, a man of the best intentions, gets himself mixed up with what *appears* to be a decent group of conservatives — with, if you please, forty million dollars to spend on the "study of honest, decent, right-wing philosophy." The conservatives turn out, he tells us further, to be "men who would subsidize evil and hatred, who would . . . revive the spirit of the Inquisition, with their wire-tappings, their secret recordings of private conversations, their bullying, their hiring of amoral [!] private detectives"; they are representatives of "swollen, pot-bellied patriotism," "bigoted, stupid, cruel and vicious people." Under the reader's very eyes, it seems, they drive a "53-year-old, bespectacled, mild-mannered teacher of economics" to *suicide,* though in the end they are told off in no uncertain terms by the educator: "My contempt for you . . . will remain with me the rest of my life."

On West's own showing, in other words (for the above is all he reveals to us about the novel itself), an absurd extravaganza. Who ever heard of a conservative research project, wicked or virtuous, with even forty thousand dollars to spend, much less forty million? The game, obviously, is to identify everything the author doesn't like with everything else he doesn't like, the rich with the conservatives with the bigoted with the enemies of our freedoms with the patriots, and discredit them all. Mr. West could have dismissed it at that and no harm done, save that the *Times* would have sent him no more books to review. Instead, we must sit and a) hear the novel described as "remarkably objective," a "vigorous defense of freedom," and b) see it used as a springboard for a diatribe against all who disagree with Mr. West on the general problem of internal security. The book is an attempt to "understand the security-minded bullying done in the name of patriotism, . . . the forces which make men anti-intellectual, anti-liberal, anti-democratic, and even anti-Christian." And the author "makes it clear that the quality of the men who judge and give evidence in loyalty hearings is shabby at best, poisonous at worst." The *Times* reader, accordingly, whatever he ends up thinking about the book, is edged along a little further toward that opinion on the loyalty program that the *Times* and Mr. West want him to hold. That is, toward the Liberal line.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Norway: Case History in Socialism

A student of socialism for more than forty years finds in the failure of the Norwegian experiment proof that democratic socialism is unworkable

MAX EASTMAN

The Norwegians have an easygoing independence that you like and admire; and they are descended from the Vikings, who were freetraders if not freebooters par excellence. This makes it remarkable that Norway has gone further in authoritarian state control than any other country this side of the Iron Curtain. Norway is ruled by a centralized and disciplined Labor Party, which began 21 years ago to put through, step by step, a program of state management of the entire economy. There has been no camouflage about this, no tricking of public opinion. It is "creeping socialism," but it has crept openly.

"Socialism" in Norway no longer means state ownership of the means of production, as it used to, and does still in Soviet Russia. Ownership remains formally in private hands, but all the fun and most of the profit is taken out of it by comprehensive and meticulous state regulation and control. As so often happens, the principal controls were adopted in the postwar and post-occupation emergency, and they are merely kept going now that the emergency is past.

The Norwegian Socialist leaders call this "planning under the control of the nation," but significantly it is being put through by less than half of the nation. The Labor Party won only 47 per cent of the votes in the last election, and wangled a parliamentary majority of only two. Its official organ, *Arbeiderbladet*, has (or had in 1952) a circulation of 63,000 against 147,000 for the conservative paper, *Aftenposten*. But the Party's discipline is such that it could rule the country with a majority of one. Both its representatives in parliament and its elected executives are "chained" to the program of the Party, which meets every two years and decides what items in the march toward Socialism are to be put through in the interim.

I quote the word "chained" from one of my friends high up in the Party councils. I know personally several leaders of the Norwegian Labor Party —including their patriarchal chief, Martin Tranmael, an old-time labor agitator in the United States. I can testify to their high and sincere idealism. They think they cast out all the evils of Soviet Marxism when they broke with the Communists in 1923 and turned to "democratic" or "evolutionary" Socialism. I think they retained some of its most dangerous traits.

That confusion of *control by the nation* with control by a disciplined party with an ideology and a class-conscious technique for assembling power, is one of them. Two principal ministers of state in Norway are heads of the trade unions who resigned on taking political office—an illustration of what I mean by class-conscious technique. This kind of Socialism does not conflict with the *forms* of representative government, but it does destroy that free, fluid interplay of minds and interests which is the life of political democracy.

Are Businessmen Persons?

Another unfortunate thing the Norwegian Socialists share with the Soviet Marxists is a feeling that businessmen are an inferior order of being. In Russia most of these indispensible members of a free community were herded into concentration camps or shot. In Norway they are treated as bad boys subject to disciplinary measures from those who speak in the name of "Labor."

The Party proposes to "safeguard personal liberty by means of a systematic management of society." The Norwegian price-control law makes a mockery of the "personal liberty" pretense—unless businessmen are not regarded as persons. This law gives to a state bureau—which means a single bureaucrat — practically unlimited control not only over prices, but over profits, dividend payments, distribution, terms of delivery, quality of products, what can be sold or bought, or even whether a firm may sell at all. I say *practically* unlimited because the bureaucrat's decisions are of course "subject to review by the courts"—a most costly and cumbersome procedure.

Aside from that remote comfort, everything depends upon what in this individual's judgment constitutes a "reasonable" price or a "deserved" profit. The word "deserved" is quoted from the Party credo, the word "reasonable" from the law itself which proclaims as its purpose: "to promote a socially reasonable development of prices, profits and business conditions; to prevent the paying out of unreasonably high dividends," etc. These vague phrases obviously contemplate a use of arbitrary power by government officials. Instead of a reign of law, they contemplate a reign by persons—which is the negation of freedom.

A man I know in Oslo who manufactures electric motors, transformers and locomotives was losing money on his motors and applied for permission to increase the price from 207 kroner to 228. The price administrator admitted the loss but denied the increase because he was "making enough money out of transformers and locomotives." Subsequently a new competitor in Bergen got a permit to sell *his* motors at 300 kroner. When this discrepancy was pointed out, the price administrator set for both manufacturers a maximum price of 220 kroner. This put the Bergen man out of business. Apparently it also disturbed the price administrator's conscience for, visiting the Oslo man again, he canceled the regulation on motors altogether! "Go it your own way," he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said, but shook a warning finger in parting: "If I find you're making too much money, I'll be around again."

"One hesitates to expand his business under such circumstances," the Oslo man said to me.

One of the least "freedom-loving" traits of the Norwegian regime, it seems to me, is a regulation empowering the government to make arbitrary "levies" on any business whose profits are deemed unreasonable. As this practice handicaps the most productive industries like whaling, mining and shipping, to the advantage of unproductive, inefficient ones, it acts as a brake on the Norwegian economy.

It is estimated, and the estimate is mentioned in the non-partisan *Norwegian Handbook,* that at the peak during the postwar years more than 250,000 maximum prices were in force. There were ceiling prices for 741 different types of window frames! One has to guess the number of "agents" required to enforce such laws—young men, for the most part, who knew nothing about business and less about the materials they were appraising. Burly Vikings were to be found in florist shops measuring the size of begonia blossoms.

Those mad days passed, but they accustomed the people to authoritarian regulations so extreme that the idea of a genuinely free market now seems fantastic. You have to get a license to build a house, and when you get a license you are confronted with so many restrictions that it stands small chance of becoming the *home* you were dreaming of. One hears those two words, "licenses" and "restrictions," in Norway as often as "openings" and "let's take a chance" in freer countries. Formally, freedom of the press is absolute, but with most everybody awaiting a license from a government bureau, businessmen are apt to suppress some of the bitterest and most barbed comments on the regime. "Systematic management of society" and "personal liberty" are in this respect, as in a thousand others, contradictory terms.

"Idealism Is a Gamble"

But of all the tales of frustration I heard in Norway, the most significant, I think, was that of Fritz Rieber, an idealistic young capitalist of Bergen. Bergen is Norway's second largest city and a thriving seaport, but the state-owned railway connecting it with Oslo 307 miles away meanders crazily and wastefully through the countryside. As a patriotic service, Rieber spent two years and $30,000 on a plan to shorten, straighten and electrify the road. Last April he got two New York banks to offer a loan of six million dollars to be repaid out of the state's saving on carrying time. Future profits would be used to give more and better service to regions where the railroads now operate at a heavy deficit. For his own time and money, already invested, Rieber contemplated no reward.

It remained only to get the government's approval, since it was a state-owned railroad. The Labor Party heads knew, of course, that the plan would benefit the national economy. But the government was intent on lowering the level of investment to curb inflation. Approval of a plan to be carried out by private enterprise might curtail other important investments contemplated by the state. Furthermore, Parliament was full of sectional jealousy. "Why," the argument ran, "should Oslo and Bergen have a better railroad when we up here in the frozen north have no railroad at all?" Against these objections the Party, with its famous discipline and its "systematic management of society," failed to take a stand. It permitted the bill to be killed.

I happened to dine with Fritz Rieber on the evening of his defeat. Though tragically disappointed, he was not bitter or cynical.

"Idealism is a gamble," he said, "and you have to take your losses like a good sport."

The remark illustrates an extraordinary feature of this struggle between statism and free enterprise in Norway: the mild good nature with which, on the whole, it is being conducted. The Socialists are not rabid and the capitalists are not raging. The Labor men, although they passed laws that would permit a virtual dictatorship, show no disposition to employ extreme measures. There are no concentration camps in Norway, no thought of political prisoners. No policemen are in evidence on the streets. (They are all inside manipulating the files, the jokers say.) And on the capitalist side, while there is plenty of complaint, the resistance never takes active form.

There is no doubt that Norway is prospering. Her standard of living is surprisingly high. Though one-fifth of her capital was lost during World War Two and half the merchant fleet destroyed, by 1952 the gross national product had risen to 150 per cent of the prewar level, and it has continued to rise. No person and no party claims the credit for this. It is too obviously due in part to postwar building helped along by Marshall Aid, in part to favorable conditions in the world market—for almost 40 per cent of Norway's income derives from exports and the earnings of her merchant fleet.

Nor is there doubt that the Labor Party has improved the lot of the fishermen and the lumberjacks, and has given the poor a larger share of the national wealth. But I heard never a word of complaint about this from the big shipowners and industrialists I met. The wholesale confiscation—for it is confiscation to deprive a man of the free disposal of his property—is endured with stoical patience. Norwegians are brought up on physical hardships; to live at all on that rocky strip of land requires a quiet fortitude; and they seem to take this political affliction in the same calm stride.

Toward Freedom

The crucial question about the Socialist experiment in Norway, of course, is: In what direction is it traveling? And the answer: It is at present traveling back toward private enterprise and a free-market economy. Without avowing it, the Labor government is, in a number of vital matters, retreating from its Socialist program. A year ago it raised the legal discount rate—fixed "in perpetuity" in 1944 at 2.5 per cent—to 3.5 per cent. And that is only the formal aspect of the change. On the "gray market" according to a recent newspaper dispatch, the rate may go as high as 8 and 9 per cent, and even respectable institutions issue loans at 5.5 and 6.5.

At the same time the government has begun to encourage private savings, which in its doctrinaire days were regarded as a menace. One of its most extreme measures was a law compelling large landholders to sell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of their farm or forest lands at the demand of small holders. The land was to be sold at a "just valuation," which was to be determined by committees of laymen. But since the committees were made up of small-holder sympathizers, the values were set so low that constitutional protection of private property was violated. This, plus the fact that the government learned that big owners could operate the forest and farm industries better than small, caused this law to be repealed on January 1, 1956.

A similar, and stranger, thing has happened in the sphere of price control. Less than three years ago the present stringent law, a war emergency measure originally, was made permanent. But as soon as it was firmly on the statute books the government began to stop enforcing it! In retail trade it seems to have faded of its own free will. In other spheres the situation has become so confused that the most astute lawyer can't figure it out. At latest report, however, the authorities seem to have become so worried about rising prices (due to inflation) that they have given the Price Directorate the signal to start again. To what extent nobody knows for sure.

It is my hunch that the Norwegian Socialists are destined to prove conclusively what the experiment in England has left doubtful in many minds: that "democratic Socialism" is unworkable. Their effort is not impeded by any great rival party. They are not troubled by a division in the labor unions. The fishermen and the lumberjacks and a great bloc of the small farmers support them to the limit. Every third year they go back to their electors with a voluminous printed document containing article-by-article the program of the previous campaign, and in the opposite column, a frank statement of what has been done, or not done, about each promise. In that earnestly efficient way democratic Socialism is being tried in Norway. There can be no complaints or alibis if their experiment fails.

In 1923 my Norwegian friends chose Socialism as against Communism—a volcanic event in the history of the world Communist movement. Is it too much to hope that in the inevitable crises to come they will choose "personal liberty" as against a "consistent planned economy"?

Letter from Taipei

From a Special Correspondent

Conditions here on Taiwan continue to improve slowly, and the Communists are building up steadily across the strait. Foreign Minister George Yeh has stated that, if the Communists attack the offshore islands, the government here will not be limited in any way as to its reaction. This means that the government will strike at the mainland bases from which the Communist attack will come, and will not restrict itself to defensive tactics.

The morale and readiness of the forces here has never been higher. The Chinese Air Force is getting Sabres, though not as rapidly as it is prepared to handle them. The Navy is small, but of course it does not need to be large in view of the Seventh Fleet. The Army is getting more and better stuff all the time, and is now being backed up by a regular reserve system, with military training compulsory for all.

Will the Communists attack this year? They don't want to, if they can get what they are after without war. Hence the Geneva talks, which are backed up by increasing preparations across the strait for a showdown. The Communists are counting on the support of all their present aims by 90 per cent of the American intellectuals, and I feel that they are realistic in this. Did you know that the Far Eastern history course in at least one of the outstanding U.S. universities is now being taught by a man who publicly advocates the surrender of Taiwan, with its ten million free people, to the Communists, and urges that Chiang and his associates be handed over to them as war criminals?

The resistance on the mainland grows. The Communists officially announce that they are daily trying in the courts a thousand cases of sedition and sabotage. They also announce that 60 per cent of the intellectuals in Communist China lack, to one or another degree, the necessary belief in and support of Communist ideas. These people need to be supported, and the first thing to do is to break off the talks at Geneva. The second thing is to announce that the U.S. will commit its forces to the defense of the offshore islands, and that these islands are an integral part of the Taiwan defense system. The third thing to do is to reject absolutely the plea of the British and Japanese for weakening the embargo on goods to Communist China. The argument that, if these goods are not shipped directly then they will be sent through the European Communist countries, is specious.

The Russians are supplying the Chinese Communists now, and every bit that they send is a drain on their own productive power. They cannot send the capital goods necessary to industrialize China rapidly; they have not got them to send. The only way in which China can be rapidly industrialized, and thereby taken off Russia's back, is by having the West, including Japan, open up and send in a flood of goods. The Chinese cannot pay for them, but are trusting the West to give them the stuff free.

It does not take much of a shift from our present trend of policy to reach the point where, in the interest of "breaking China away from the Soviets" (as the British and American intellectuals put it), we will be ready to engage in full-scale trade with Communist China. The Japanese are straining at the bit right now. Their shipping enters northern Chinese Communist ports, exchanging consumer goods for raw materials. Their policy is non-recognition but full-scale trade at the same time.

We show no signs of protecting Southeast Asia from Communist influence; and this being the case, Japan *must* trade with the Communists if she is to live. The adoption of the policies toward the Chinese Communists mentioned above would do much to stop the slide of Southeast Asia into the Communist camp, and to change the Japanese attitude.

As to the relations between Peiping and Moscow, we should know by now that, whether or not they are good, they are always strong: the Russians have penetrated every cranny of the life of China.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAW OF THE LAND

C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS

Immunity Act of 1954 Held Valid

On March 26 the Supreme Court announced a decision on a subject with a long, long background.

Factual controversies in the enforcement of the anti-trust and interstate commerce laws were largely eliminated by legislation adopted in 1893 and upheld in 1896, the so-called "immunity" law. This statute authorized the courts to compel testimony despite the plea of the Fifth Amendment, but provided that the witness receive immunity from criminal prosecution in connection with any matter to which his testimony related. The Supreme Court's decision in 1896 was in the case of *Brown v. Walker.*

Subsequently similar immunity provisions were embodied in virtually all regulatory statutes enacted by Congress, including the National Prohibition Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Federal Power Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Price Control Act and the Atomic Energy Act—altogether over thirty statutes. These immunity provisions brought no protest either from the Liberal community, presumably concerned with civil rights, or from the business community, at whom the enactments were primarily directed. Numerous judicial decisions, some of them by the Supreme Court, interpreted and applied these statutes, and invariably assumed their validity.

Although the problems of espionage and treason had long been obvious, it was not until 1954 that Congress adopted a corresponding statute applicable to national security, the "Immunity Act of 1954." And although the constitutionality of successive extensions of the compulsory testimony-immunity concept had not since 1904 been challenged by witnesses brought within its scope, when the concept was made applicable to investigations of the Communist conspiracy, the first witness affected demanded that *Brown v. Walker* be overruled. This witness was William Ludwig Ullman, a Soviet espionage agent who had served in the Elizabeth Bentley-Harry Dexter White ring.

The courts duly and carefully reexamined *Brown v. Walker.* On March 26 the Supreme Court held the new Act constitutional by a vote of seven to two. The opinion of the Court was written by Justice Frankfurter; Justice Douglas wrote the dissenting opinion in which Justice Black concurred.

History of the Privilege

It would be a mistake, however, to regard the immunity law as a bright idea first thought up in 1893 as a way of getting around the Fifth Amendment in order to get evidence to prevent railroad rebates and suppress trusts. The fact is that this procedure was adopted from the very inception of the privilege against self-incrimination—that it was embodied in the British law in 1791, the year when the Bill of Rights became a part of our Constitution. It has been repeatedly held that the purpose of the Fifth Amendment was to put in constitutional form the privilege against self-incrimination as it was then understood in Great Britain.

Our knowledge of this background is fortified by the records of a debate in the House of Lords in May 1742. The question before the House was the enactment of a bill to grant immunity to witnesses pleading the privilege in the course of a Parliamentary investigation into the conduct of his office by Robert Walpole as Chancellor of the Exchequer. The advocates of the bill, led by the Duke of Argyll, reviewed the precedents for compelling testimony by the immunity procedure; its opponents, led by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, argued against the particular bill on the ground that under the circumstances it was unfair to Walpole, but in substance conceded the validity of Argyll's statement of past practice. As the privilege had not evolved until about 1700 this debate indicates its meaning from its very origin in so far as this aspect of it is concerned.

When in Great Britain, in a criminal case after 1700, the prosecution needed the testimony of a witness who, they thought, might plead the privilege, the law officers of the Crown procured a royal pardon. If the witness did invoke the privilege he was required to accept the pardon and to testify. For Parliamentary investigations it was customary to enact a special law, usually applicable only to a single investigation but occasionally to a class of cases. One of the first such immunity acts was adopted in the early 1720's to facilitate the Parliamentary investigation into the famous "South Sea Bubble."

Between the American Revolution and 1896 immunity acts had been held to be consistent with constitutional provisions against self-incrimination by the highest courts of the states of Arkansas, Georgia, California, Indiana, New York, New Hampshire and North Carolina.

Dissenting Opinions

The dissent of Justices Douglas and Black is largely confined to an argument that the witness will be required to expose "infamy." This is an argument repeatedly overruled in the course of two and a half centuries. As Judge Frank of the Federal Court of Appeals at New York has pointed out, "History shows that not the disgrace of admitting criminal conduct but the danger of punishment is at the heart of the privilege."

Unfortunately Justice Frankfurter's opinion takes off with *Brown v. Walker* in 1896; Justice Douglas' dissent goes back to the eighteenth century and includes many historical and other arguments easily answered.

Justice Frankfurter's opinion, unlike those written on behalf of the Court by Justice Moody in 1908 and by Justice Cardozo in 1937, which intimated that the privilege against self-incrimination was pretty second-rate, begins with a eulogy of the Fifth Amendment. It seems curious that a constitutional provision so unfashionable when primarily used by monopolists and grafters should acquire luster when principally obstructing the investigation of traitors. But at least it is not so lustrous that it is no longer subject to immunity laws.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letter from the Continent

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

Munich

During the Russian occupation of Germany and Austria it happened again and again that a man or woman in a group of prisoners, marching through the streets and crying bitterly, was released and an equally innocent bystander was pushed into his or her place. A specific number of victims had to be delivered. And the exact number was indeed jailed, shot or sent to an Arctic camp. Who these people were hardly ever mattered to the guards.

This sort of summary and senseless procedure is typical of the USSR, and here are a few recent cases. Among the returnees from Russia we in Europe welcomed Dr. Aloysius Marquardt, last Vicar General of the Diocese of Varmia (East Prussia). He had fled with his Bishop in 1944 to Berlin, where he hoped to stay until the end of the war. In August 1945 he and his secretary, Father Parchau, were asked by a Soviet major to give certain information about the archives of the diocese. The Vicar General was flown to Moscow and jailed in a heavily guarded house, thirty miles from the Red capital.

From then on, Dr. Marquardt's fate recapitulates all of Kafka's novels, combined in one crazy nightmare. The Russians did not try to extract any secret whatsoever from him, and with the exception of a later accusation of "espionage on behalf of the Vatican," no formal charges were ever levelled against him. Yet he was dragged from jail to jail, from one examining magistrate to another. Frequently he was faced by real fiends, by sadistic torturers; but then again he encountered officials who were no less in the dark than he was. He had been arrested, he was in the heart of Russia, he had to be charged with something; so they implored him to make a "confession" about something, *anything*. In 1951 the questions became a little more specific. He was promised a trial. But one day an officer came into his cell and told him bluntly that he had been given fifteen years for informing Rome about conditions in East Prussia.

Dr. Marquardt was sent across Siberia to the concentration camp of Alexandrovsk, not too far from the Pacific Ocean. Here he met thousands of other prisoners, all condemned for political "crimes" and coming from all over the world. A Japanese officer, a Jew from Latvia, and a Mohammedan from the Caucasus became his closest friends. The daily fare consisted of cabbage soup, half an ounce of meat, one ounce of sugar and eleven ounces of bread. The mortality rate was accordingly high; but after Stalin's death things looked a little brighter. Dr. Adenauer's trip to Moscow brought liberty to Dr. Marquardt and many other survivors.

A peasant woman in Western Austria recently received a "letter" in the form of a piece of cardboard from her son whom she had thought dead years ago. The "boy," who is now 33 years old, has spent more than one third of his life behind barbed wire in a Siberian "silence-camp" whose location has been kept secret. None of his numerous letters during the past ten years had arrived; but a returnee brought the heartening message. In spite of all Russian assurances that there are no more Austrian prisoners left, there are still a number of them languishing in various concentration camps. These wretched men—some working, some idle — have never even been accused of crimes. But they were completely cut off from their parents, their children, their wives. I doubt that there is special malice behind such cases; just the inefficiency and indifference of a colossal, unwieldy and criminal bureaucratic machine.

I obtained some insight into the workings of Soviet bureaucracy from the wife of a German diplomat, who, together with her husband, had been arrested in Sofia in 1944. She was told that if she wanted to "stay with her husband" she had to face the charge of "espionage." Neither she nor her husband had done anything deviating from diplomatic routine, but she was determined to accompany him. She spent eleven years in the same building with him (near Moscow), but was seen by him only once, from a distance, while walking in the prison court.

In 1948, her interrogations started. Her inquisitors refused to believe that, some time before World War Two, her sister, who lived in Brazil, had invited her to South America. "What government paid for the trip?" "None. My sister sent me the ticket." "You want us to believe that a private individual could actually pay the fare? At least four hundred dollars?" They were sure that her visit had been connected with training for espionage.

In 1950 she received a writ which contained her "confession" about her background, upbringing, family, and was asked to sign it. She would have done so if it had not included one untrue statement as ludicrous as it was immaterial, *i.e.*, that her father had worked as a coal-miner in Belgium. She declared that she would sign the rest but would exclude this sentence; she was afraid, she declared, that her signature under a manifest untruth might be used as evidence against her veracity. Her refusal created consternation. First she was threatened. Then the director of the jail came and, with tears in his eyes, implored her to change her mind: if she did not sign the unchanged text, the whole document would have to go back to Moscow and there they would take it out on her jailers. Had she no loyalty to her jail or pity for her jailers? Was there no humanity left in her? For three weeks she struggled. Then she gave in (still afraid that this weakness might cost her her neck).

At the trial, the lady was given five years at hard labor. The fallacious statement about her father never figured in the trial: it had actually been due to a clerical error.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The THIRD WORLD WAR

JAMES BURNHAM

The Long Silence of Mao Tse-tung

Under the form of the anti-Stalin campaign, the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement are making the sharpest turn since 1930. Whatever else this campaign signifies, we may be certain that it expresses an acute struggle for power within the Communist apparatus. The present turn, like those of the past (the turns to the Popular Front or the Hitler Pact, for example) is the occasion for a kind of security check on the entire world revolutionary army. Each Communist is now expected to stand up before the eyes of his comrades to be counted.

The pronouncement of the anti-Stalin formulas was made at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Party. According to established ritual these must be echoed in every Party unit in all countries. During the weeks since the Congress ended, this has been happening, though not without screeching of brakes and some lost passengers. Still, one after another the inspectors have been reporting in: from Warsaw, London, Jakarta, New York, Bucharest, Santiago, Tokyo, Mexico, Prague, Singapore, Paris, New Delhi, Budapest, Ottawa, Reykjavik, Cairo.

The post that was the last to be heard from was the one that ranks first, except for Moscow—if indeed it grants that exception—in the world revolutionary deployment.

Marx-Lenin-Stalin-?

It took seven weeks for the Chinese Party to declare itself. The leader of the Chinese Party, Mao Tse-tung, did not attend the 20th Congress, though the chiefs of the French Party and Italian Party as well as of all the East European satellite parties were there. (One of them, Beirut of Poland, stayed on, as a corpse.) Mao, remaining at home, sent Chu Teh to read a formal address in his name. This address, alone at the Congress, had good, and only good, words about Stalin.

Judged by individual qualities and accomplishments, Mao is today, and by far, the greatest exemplar of world Communism. There are substantial figures among the present Russian elite, but considered as individuals they all rate well below Mao. Starting with a cadre even smaller than Lenin's, Mao led the revolutionary conquest of the most heavily populated country on earth. He has demonstrated profound strategic understanding, and a capacity to endure through defeat and disaster as firmly as through triumph. In theoretical analysis he has made literate extensions of Marxian doctrine.

As a military leader Mao must be classed with the Great Captains of history. He has proved his creative mastery of tactics, strategy and Grand Strategy. For his twenty-five-year civil war Mao devised both a basic plan and specific methods of struggle that were perfectly suited to the means at his disposal, the nature of the country, and the environing context of world politics. His flexible intelligence has been displayed in his tactical development of guerrilla warfare, his target determination, and his shrewd exploitation of political and moral factors abroad as well as at home.

As an individual, indeed, there was no reason after 1950 for Mao to give even Stalin precedence. However, Stalin had back of him more firmly organized power, the prestige of longer incumbency, and control of the international apparatus. Mao knew, also, that technical and political help from Stalin's regime had been essential to his own victory, and was still required for consolidating a Communist China.

But with Stalin dead, even though Communist China still needs Soviet help, there is no one in the Communist world who has an objective claim to be named ahead of — or even alongside — Mao Tse-tung. If there is to be a No. 1 Communist, then, as Mao must judge, he must be it. And if Mao is recognized as No. 1, this would inevitably mark a shift in the center of the world revolution away from Moscow toward Peiping.

Whose Collective Leadership?

Although the 20th Congress was formally a Soviet Party meeting, it was intended to serve for the world Communist enterprise. It has been so accepted by all Communist organizations, including now the Chinese Party.

Undoubtedly the denunciation of Stalin, and the shift of slogans from "the cult of personality" to "collective leadership," are immediately related to the struggle for power within the Soviet Party. But it would seem probable that on another level they are also related to a struggle for power, incipient if not yet joined, within the broader Communist world.

Would it not have been natural for Mao to demand as his right the mantle of Marx-Lenin-Stalin? If he did so, then the call of the Soviet chiefs for collective leadership was a proposal to Mao that combined compromise with threat. With one emphasis it suggested: at the new stage of the Revolution no one individual and no one state will be predominant; Mao and Khrushchev, China and the Soviet Union, are comrades and equals. But with another it threatened: do not try to grasp individual leadership, for yourself or your state, or Soviet power backed by the forces of international Communism will crush you as we have crushed so many others.

This second interpretation connects plainly enough with the pre-Congress trip of Bulganin and Khrushchev, the long-range purpose of which could only be to begin assembling in Southeast Asia a counterweight to China. In the documents of the 20th Congress, India and Yugoslavia are referred to as if they were more integrally than China part of the Soviet political system. And both Tito and Nehru hailed the Congress' anti-Stalin declaration within twenty-four hours.

Within the next period Mao will surely act to make his weight felt.

In short, the slogan of "collective leadership" is only a polite way of stating the fact that no one has yet managed to crown himself Boss.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Daily Worker Finds Friends

The Liberals never protest federal action against tax-delinquent papers—unless they are Communist. Then it's "interference with freedom of the press"

RALPH DE TOLEDANO

At 1 p.m. on March 27, Treasury agents moved in on Communist Party headquarters and the New York offices of the *Daily Worker*. The T-men carried nothing more lethal than writs and tax liens charging that the CPUSA owed the government $389,265 in delinquent taxes and fines. The lien against the *Worker* was for $46,049.

This "raid," as it came to be called, was in no way unprecedented, and the manner in which it had been carried out was in every way routine. Since January 1955, the Communist Party and the *Daily Worker*, unmolested until then for reasons which the American public will never know, had balked at requests to begin belated compliance with the Internal Revenue statutes. The Party had blandly brushed aside all inquiries from tax agents by saying that "we keep no books" and "we're tax exempt." Party attorneys conceded that they had never applied for tax exemption, as the law requires. Nor had they ever filed a statement of income and expenditures with the Congress, as legitimate political parties must do under the terms of another statute.

The *Daily Worker*, official Communist organ but organized as a private corporation to evade prosecution as a foreign agent, claimed that it had been losing some $200,000 a year, but refused to divulge how and from where this deficit had been met. The "books" it showed tax agents were hopelessly inadequate and would have landed any other corporation's officers in jail.

Donald R. Moysey, district collector for southern New York, naively acted as he would have in any other case. Setting an "arbitrary" figure based on available information, he slapped a tax lien on the *Worker* and the Party, seizing what tangible assets he could. Normally, the next step would have been a legal adjudication of the case.

The operative word is "normally." For there is a certain segment of the public which seems to believe that the laws of the land do not apply to Communists. Understandably, the Moscow and Peiping radios took up the *Daily Worker's* immediate cry of "censorship," infringed "freedom of the press," etc. But they had allies in the United States. As if by prearranged signal, the American Civil Liberties Union, the *New York Post*, the *New York Times*, and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom took up the cry of "press freedom." The culprit, of course, was not the *Worker* which had violated the law, but Mr. Moysey for enforcing it. (In New York, the Scripps-Howard organization and the *Daily News* applauded the seizure. And Thomas Murphy, vice president of the American Newspaper Guild, said, "Freedom of the press doesn't relieve anyone of paying taxes." But these were exceptions.)

New York Post editor James A. Wechsler, who had remained notably silent about academic freedom when a professor was fired from American University in Washington after appearing as a *friendly* witness before the House Un-American Activities Committee, rushed into print with as false and cynical an editorial as he has ever written. Charging that the Internal Revenue Service had set a "precedent," that it had moved "to seize and padlock first, and argue after," the *Post* said, "the raids will be universally interpreted as proof that America has succumbed to the delusion that there is a clear and present domestic Communist threat"— a "delusion" shared by the Supreme Court.

The *New York Times* pontificated: "Even in a tax case it is incumbent on the government to take no action that can be interpreted as an effort to suppress any segment of the press, however unpopular." (For those who came in late, the "seizure" did not halt publication of the *Daily Worker;* it did not even miss a single issue.)

The American Civil Liberties Union, which may some day concern itself with the rights of anti-Communists, called the *Daily Worker* tax lien "an infringement on freedom of the press," the action on the Party a "harassment of the Communist Party."

A minority within the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, acting without consulting the membership, issued a blast protesting "this much interference with the democratic right to publish freely" and found it "farcical" to believe that the *Worker* had assets. The statement was written by Irwin Ross, one of the *New York Post's* captive intellectuals.

In all of this hysteria, this talk about "Palmer raids" from men who obviously have no knowledge of what those raids were, *every single New York daily newspaper* (and presumably this applies to the rest of the nation) *omitted vital information.*

The facts, as *Editor & Publisher* informedly noted, were these: "Neither the *Daily Worker*, nor the American Civil Liberties Union, nor anyone else, raised a hand or a voice of protest when a daily in Ketchikan, Alaska, a daily in Carmi, Illinois, a weekly in Mississippi, a daily in Oregon, and a weekly in California, were closed down by T-men in recent years . . . But when it happens to the *Daily Worker* we are suddenly overrun with bleeding hearts for our disappearing freedom of the press. . . . Treasury agents do deserve credit, however, for not preventing the paper from going to press although this has been upheld as being legal and justified in some other tax lien cases against newspapers."

A second well-known fact which somehow remained out of the newspapers: The Communist Party in its heyday invested millions of dollars in private business, real estate, etc. The names of some of these dummy corp-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orations are no secret. The income the Party derives from these investments is taxable; but the Party has refused to produce its books. And the *Daily Worker* has never adequately confided to the government just how it has met a claimed over-all deficit of some $5 million.

This was more than sufficient ground for a tax seizure. It might be argued that the timing was poor — providing a distraction when the Communists were writhing over the issue of Stalin's "infallibility." But here again, it was the American press which, leaping to the *Worker's* defense and belaboring Mr. Moysey, gave the Communists a chance to pose as martyrs.

The question remains: Why the hysteria? Echo answers: the climate of the times. Anyone who does anything which might conceivably give the Communists offense is, *ipso facto*, a reactionary dog.

Maryland

In Population, Problems and Politics, State Is No Longer Part of the South

SAM M. JONES

Many states are heterogeneous, but Maryland is more so than most. The name evokes a variety of visions: the metropolis of Baltimore; the harsh coal mining country of the West and North; the marine delights of the Eastern shore; the antique enchantment of the Southern counties; rich farm lands; great industries. Maryland is enriched by its contrasts, united by its individualism.

The Maryland counties adjoining Washington have become huge suburbs of the national capital. The perennial housing shortage in the District of Columbia is the great centrifugal force which each year propels more federal employees and other Washingtonians deeper into Maryland (and Virginia). Another recent influence is the integration problem. Washington public schools are integrated, as are some of those in the nearby counties of the adjoining state. But the latter have relatively few Negro residents, and there has been little resistance to the Supreme Court decision. In Washington, too, desegregation was effected without incident; but there is a corollary hidden in the city's vital statistics. In 1940 the Negro population was slightly under 29 per cent. The 1950 census showed an increase to 35 per cent. The Library of Congress has no later statistics, but Population Reference Bureau, Inc. has compiled more recent figures from a number of official sources. These show an increase in the Negro population to 41 per cent in 1955 and a similar comparative differential in birth statistics. In the 1949 table of birth rates per thousand of population, 23.6 were white; 32.6 non-white. In 1954 the ratio was, white 19.6; non-white 30.3. A sidelight is thrown on the picture by the decline in automobile licenses issued by the District government. There were 10,000 fewer applications in 1955 than in 1954. The District's loss represented a substantial part of the increase in nearby Maryland and Virginia.

The traditional viewpoint that sees Maryland as a part of the South and the Democratic Party is geographically inconsistent and politically untenable. Baltimore is north of Cincinnati, Kansas City, Topeka, Denver and San Francisco. Maryland has gone Republican in eight of the last fourteen Presidential elections. Like the "safe" Republican state of Kansas, Maryland was carried by Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and 1916. Like Republican Oregon, the state went to Roosevelt four times; but unlike many states normally Republican, gave its electoral vote to Dewey in 1948. Truman won seven of its twenty-three counties and Baltimore City. He carried Montgomery, but lost Prince Georges County. In 1952 Eisenhower made a clean sweep of the counties, leaving only Baltimore City to Stevenson by the scant plurality of 12,000 votes.

Both of Maryland's U.S. Senators and three of its seven Representatives are Republican. Republican Governor Theodore R. McKeldin, Jr., was re-elected to a four-year term in 1954. John Marshall Butler defeated the veteran Democrat Millard E. Tydings in 1950. James Glenn Beall was elected Senator in 1952.

President Eisenhower is considered far stronger today in Maryland than any potential Democratic nominee. While Stevenson is still the personal choice of a majority of the Democratic professionals, a campaign for the nomination of Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri is making some headway. Kefauver has a large following and will probably get the state's Convention delegation by default.

The big battle in Maryland this year is the Senatorial contest. Former Senator Tydings is trying for a comeback but he has stiff competition in the primary. His opponent is George P. Mahoney, a millionaire contractor, who has had a long and unsuccessful record of running for office. Mahoney has, however, acquired a statewide following, and it is considered more than a possibility that he will terminate Tydings' campaign for "vindication" in the May 7 primary. The former Senator has the blessing of Baltimore's Mayor Thomas (Tony) D'Allessandro, but many of the party leaders have refused to take sides in the primary fight. Mahoney has the backing of labor to a moderate degree and is expected to run well in some of the most populous counties.

Tydings, who considers himself the No. 1 victim of "McCarthyism," got his campaign off to a slow start, waiting for a draft movement that failed to materialize. He is further handicapped by loss of touch with his former constituents. For every loyal supporter who rallied to his standard in the great days of Roosevelt's attempted purge, there are probably half a dozen voters who have no memory of that event and to whom Tydings' name is but vaguely familiar.

By far the worst of Mr. Tydings' tribulations, however, is the enthusiastic support of the admirers of Owen Lattimore. If this fails to beat him in the primary, he will face the much more difficult task of trying to win against Senator Butler. Whether Mahoney or Tydings wins the Democratic nomination, Butler is expected to be the favorite for reelection.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the Academy

RUSSELL KIRK

The Achievement of Dr. Hobbs

The Fund for the Republic is spending a great deal of money in an endeavor to discover Fear among teachers. Men seldom fail to discover what they seek, if they have sufficient money to spend in the pursuit; and a representative of that Fund recently remarked in my presence that the Fund knew that teachers were terrorized, and was now proceeding to document its assumption. Well, I should be astonished if the Fund were unable to find any fear among teachers. For teaching is a fearful occupation, in more senses than one. A sardonic friend of mine and I once walked along the streets of a neat college-town, observing the swaggering progressively-educated children of the professors and the Milquetoast manners of their fathers. "This," said my friend, "is a city of brave children and timid men." Few men know better than does Mr. Robert Hutchins, head of the Fund for the Republic, just how timorous professors and teachers are: for he has bullied and browbeaten the species for some decades, with conspicuous success. Certainly some people at the University of Chicago quaked at the name of Robert M. Hutchins.

So it always is heartening to hear of a scholar who is also a man of courage. Such a gentleman is Dr. A. H. Hobbs, of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Hobbs is the author of two very valuable books, *The Claims of Sociology: a Critique of Textbooks,* and *Social Problems and Scientism.* Some distinguished sociologists — Dean R. A. Nisbet of the University of California among them — have described these works as original and vigorous contributions toward the improvement of social science. They have had a large sale and a considerable influence. The writing of them took courage: for, despite all its protestations of neoterism, sociology is thoroughly dominated by an entrenched orthodoxy. And these books protest against the heavy hands of neo-positivism and egalitarian collectivism that bear down upon sociological thought in America nowadays.

The Claims of Sociology (1951) is a very thorough and systematic examination of this dull domination. Dr. Hobbs analyzes eighty-three textbooks in sociology and related fields, and concludes that the sociologists and educationists, for the most part, are subject, consciously or unconsciously, to a set of assumptions profoundly hostile to established social institutions, and founded upon the skimpiest sort of social statics. "Severe criticism appears justified," he writes, "because textbook authors continue to mock the fundamental rules of scientific presentation and persist in flaunting their 'objectivity' as a protective banner under which they parade their prejudice." That Dr. Hobbs' conclusion was supported by really convincing evidence was calculated only to make him the less popular with the dominant clique in departments of sociology: it is distressing to a doctrinaire who professes "objectivity" to be requested actually to be objective. Yet only by such a reform, Dr. Hobbs thinks, can modern sociology be of real value in our civilization.

Social Problems and Scientism (1953) is a criticism of the presumptuous claims of many sociologists that their work is an exact science, with an exact science's prerogatives of prediction and control. Hostile toward religion, tradition and many aspects of American constitutional government, the devotees of scientism would alter society and human nature to conform to their abstractions. Persons who set their faces against these claims, Dr. Hobbs concludes, take their careers in their hands:

> In pursuit of the alternative course you run the risk of being labelled bigoted, reactionary, conservative, ethnocentric, mid-Victorian, irrational, emotional, and unscientific. . . . You run the risk of certain and severe punishment of violations by yourself and your sons should you deviate. You will have to give up some comfort and some pleasure and sacrifice certain present gain for doubtful future reward.

Now Professor Hobbs made that choice. He did not expect his books to be popular with the dominant clique in departments of sociology. But even he, probably, was surprised at the bigotry and intolerance of the reaction against him. It is quite possible honestly to disagree with Dr. Hobbs; but it is not possible honestly to maintain that he is a poor scholar. He is a highly distinguished scholar, contributing frequently to the *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* the *American Sociological Review,* the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* and other learned journals; he is the author, also, of *Differentials in Internal Migration* (1941). One might assume that his colleagues would be pleased to be associated with such a professor, however much they might differ with his opinions.

But the reaction of many of his colleagues, and of his own department of sociology, is described in Dr. E. Merrill Root's *Collectivism on the Campus.* Some tried to have him discharged altogether; he was denied promotion; and only by the bringing of some influence to bear was any increase of salary granted to him. (His salary remains inadequate.) Some called him a Machiavellian; others, a modern Metternich; yet others, a gadfly. The most interesting epithet was "Super-Egghead": for the ritualistic left-liberal, though so vociferous about "anti-intellectualism," rejoices in his own variety of anti-intellectualism.

I am suggesting that scholars do have some reason for fear in our time; but the oppressive orthodoxy which has power to blight their careers does not appear to be, ordinarily, the "rightist" influences which the Fund for the Republic is sedulous to expose. Professor Hobbs, though he has suffered for the cause of candor, is not afraid. Yet we ought not to expect scholars to endure privation and vituperation when they venture to dissent from this secular orthodoxy. It would be encouraging to think that the Fund for the Republic intends to look into such cases as that of Dr. Hobbs; but I have my doubts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

The skeleton that audibly rattled in Eugene O' Neill's family closet for the thirty-five years of his artistic career is now released to haunt the public domain. But it is a tired old skeleton. And the noises it makes will send not a single shiver down a normal spine.

O'Neill's posthumously published *Long Day's Journey into Night* (New Haven: Yale University Press) was expected to bare the master's heart and to reach into his creative secrets. The play, written in 1940, was dedicated to O'Neill's wife, Carlotta, with a reputed injunction against public disclosure for a considerable period of time. Ever since, the world-wide, learned and devoted circle of O'Neill scholars had been buzzing with rumors about the profundities contained in that shamelessly honest confessional. It turned out to be an honest confessional all right. But the profundities remain buried with O'Neill.

Long Day's Journey into Night employs five actors for almost four hours, in four acts, without the benefit of a plot. In short, it's in the authentic O'Neill tradition. The (sometimes excruciatingly retarded) action takes place in 1912, in the Illinois summer home of James Tyrone, a second-rate actor and, indubitably, a first-rate replica of Eugene O'Neill's father. From 8:30 in the morning to about midnight of the same day (indeed, a very long day's journey into night), Tyrone's wife, Mary, tries to comprehend why she became a drug addict; his elder son, James, why he became a coarse lush; and his younger son Edmund (Eugene O'Neill), why he has ended up as a tubercular and hopelessly misanthropic poet. The fifth *persona dramatis* is Cathleen, a servant girl, whose only visible place in the author's design is, I'm afraid, to provide what is known in the trade as comic relief. (She doesn't.)

Now some of the greatest plays of the world theater (and some possibly immortal plays of Eugene O'Neill) have triumphed without much of a plot. For, on the whole, the Broadway busybodies who implore the playwright to send his audience on a nervous binge could not be more wrong. From *Antigone* to *King Lear* and *Faust,* the stage is alive with majestic human appearances whose every word and every sigh is more heartrending and important to us than any conceivable deed could be. The dramatic poet conquers the world, and his audience, with what he has to say — literally to *say.*

But what has O'Neill to say in *Long Day's Journey into Night*? This play, he asserts in his dedication to Carlotta, is "written in tears and blood . . . with deep pity and understanding and forgiveness for *all* the four haunted Tyrones." But of pity there is little in it, and even less of understanding, and not a shade of forgiveness. It is tragic only in the sense in which Tchaikovsky's *Symphonie Pathétique* can claim its title: the props used — all those strings, and oboes, and drums — were meant to squeeze the last tear out of you. (I, of course, refuse to cry over Tchaikovsky. On the contrary, I find him ludicrous: he constantly cries in my beer. His shameless sentimentalism is merely embarrassing. Music that strikes me as tragic is, for example, Mozart's D-minor Piano Concerto, or his G-minor Quintet: the *controlled* emotion, the divine *mésure,* has turned a personal outcry into a universal statement — the exact function of art.

Eugene O'Neill, no doubt, wrote this play to cure himself of a deep pain; and one hopes that he, at least, attained some kind of catharsis. But the reader won't. The reader won't even be aware that he is witnessing a tragedy. What he really peeks in on (with a disquieting sense of intrusion) is one hell of a mess, produced by the accidental and moronic stinginess of the father. For, it turns out, Mother Mary took to the needle, Brother James to booze, and Brother Edmund to tubercular poetry, merely because Father Tyrone had the deplorable judgment to seek the advice of only the cheapest doctors. This, I swear, is the final answer Eugene O'Neill found (on his pilgrimage to pity and understanding and forgiveness) to the fundamental queries of his life.

That it is an irrelevant answer i the least of my objections. Somewha more important is the almost incred ible fact that in this major work of a indubitable master there is not a singl line of beautiful prose. Rather, the pla abounds with lines like this: "You can't change a leopard's spots." Or: "The past is the present, isn't it? It's the future, too." Or: "Then Nietzsche must be right."

Speaking of Nietzsche, *Long Day's Journey into Night* has finally confirmed a notion I have entertained since I first encountered O'Neill's dramatic signature (which, let us face it, happened more than thirty years ago). Eugene O'Neill, it always seemed to me, was a *European* playwright, displaced in America and, thus, altogether displaced. And when he was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1936, I suggested (in print) that this was nothing but European arrogance: the American playwright was honored by Europe's intelligentsia, not because they really believed in his greatness, but because the fellow had enough sense to write like a European! This contention is now corroborated by O'Neill's *Pro Vita Sua.* In the stage directions to the First Act, O'Neill specifies *absolutely gratuitously* (for it has not the slightest bearing on the scenery or the events) the contents of a small bookcase in the back: "Balzac, Zola, Stendhal; philosophical and sociological works by Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Marx, Engels, Kropotkin, Max Sterner; plays by Ibsen, Shaw, Strindberg; poetry by Swinburne, Rosetti, Wilde, Dowson, Kipling, etc."

This is the conceptual world that has formed Edmund (*i.e.,* Eugene O'Neill). In this world of a bookcase, there is not a single American writer — no Melville, no Twain, no Thoreau, no Jefferson, no Hawthorne, no Adams, no James. And there is not a single European writer unattached to the great European *malaise* (*le fin de siècle*) — the despair of horrified man who has abolished God. ("God is dead," O'Neill quotes Nietzsche.)

I have no special knowledge of God's whereabouts. But I know that, in this motley company, O'Neill's sense of tragedy has of necessity withered. As "Edmund," he finally so defined his view of the nature of man: "We are such stuff as manure is made of." Perhaps we are. But if so, then we are no such stuff as tragedy is made of.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Ominous Parallel

FREDA UTLEY

The tragic story of German resistance to Hitler's tyranny, before and during the war, remains significant because of the close and ominous parallel between the attitude of the West toward "the Germans" yesterday and "the Russians" today. This book (*20 July*, by Constantine FitzGibbon, Norton, $3.75), admirably points up the parallel. For it shows how again and again German resistance forces were discouraged and emasculated by the appeasement policies of England and France before the war, and subsequently by the lack of interest in London and Washington in a successful rebellion against the Nazi tyranny.

"After Munich," Constantine FitzGibbon writes, "many Germans who sincerely loathed Hitler and his ways, lost all faith in the Western statesmen and peoples who had so apparently preferred dishonor to danger." One thinks immediately of the Russians, Poles, Czechs, Chinese and other peoples under the Communist iron heel, and asks how many of them are later disheartened and disillusioned by the behavior of Western statesmen? For the Geneva Summit conference, and the evident desire of the West for peace—or peace of mind—at any price, may well have left them convinced, like most Germans two decades ago, that there is "no choice save to make the best of tyranny at home."

This book tells of the officers and gentlemen who lost their lives in the last of several attempts to kill Hitler, destroy the Nazi power, and surrender to the West before D-Day (on the understanding that the Germans would continue fighting to keep the Red Army out of Europe). They were not only denied any assurance that by succeeding they would save their country and Europe; the British and American Governments refused even to commit themselves to stopping aerial bombardment of German cities once the Nazis were overthrown. Allen Dulles, who as head of the OSS had skillfully prepared the necessary channels of communication between the Allied governments and the conspirators (at great danger, of course, to the latter's personal security), found that "somewhere in London and Washington the speaking tube was blocked by prejudice, suspicion and rancor." As Mr. Dulles himself wrote in *Germany's Underground*, "Both Washington and London were fully advised beforehand on all the conspirators were attempting to do, but it seemed that those who determined policy were making the military task as difficult as possible by uniting all Germans to resist to the bitter end."

The author of *20 July* regards the *atentado* as one of the most remarkable events of our generation. He believes, for instance, that if the conspirators had succeeded it would have been well-nigh impossible for Roosevelt and Churchill to refuse to accept General Rommel's surrender to the West, thus saving countless American and British lives and keeping Russia out of Europe. But he believes, still more urgently, that the action of the Germans who tried and failed and were shot or hanged or committed suicide, was a startling departure from the principles and practices of our century, when, he says, it is "*practically unknown for a man to act politically with neither doctrine nor party, but only his conscience behind him.*" (Italics mine.)

Mr. FitzGibbon sees our age as one in which we have not only supped full on horrors, but in which the greatest horror of all—because it is the root of all the others—is

> the individual's negation of responsibility in favor of the party, the movement, the ideology. In past ages this would have been accurately described as the selling of souls. . . .

These passages give some idea of the rare quality of FitzGibbon's thought. The book is, moreover, packed with the drama and suspense of a great historical novel. The protagonists come alive in its pages as individuals. One of them is General von Trescow, whose ancestors had been soldiers ever since the Middle Ages—a man so clear-headed about the traditional values of the Prussian military aristocracy from which he sprang that he was a convinced and determined anti-Nazi in 1938. "None of us," he said, "can complain of his fate. Whoever joined the resistance movement put on the shirt of Nessus. The worth of a man is certain only if he is prepared to sacrifice his life for his convictions."

However, the utterances of London and Washington either repeated the Nazi lie that the conspirators were "a small clique of ambitious officers," or echoed the Moscow line that only "the workers" could or would liberate Germany. The RAF dropped leaflets over Germany saying that "the German workers can expect as little permanent good from a revolt led by German Generals as the workers of any other land." British and American newspapers said it was just as well that the attempt had failed, and that if it had succeeded the government set up after the overthrow of the Nazis would have been "no less untouchable" than Hitler's.

Constantine FitzGibbon asks whether it is unfair to suggest that Washington and London were "debasing policy to gratify the same furious and diabolical emotions in their own countries which had raised Hitler to power." He seems to be unaware of the evi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dence now available concerning current Communist influences in America, and the Communists' role in the Morgenthau plan and our other crimes and follies. But he does argue that the distorted view of Germany prevalent in the West was largely the result of the influence of émigrés, that most of the latter were Leftists, and that many of these Communists were "the most vocal, the most disciplined, and therefore the most clearly heard." Accordingly the West "lumped the German army, the Churches and the civil service together with Hitler as 'the Right,' and the Socialists and Communists as the virtuous 'Left,'" while in point of fact the really active opposition to Hitler stemmed from the Conservatives.

Constantine FitzGibbon further comments that the Western Allies failed to understand that the Germans were "themselves an oppressed people who lived in an occupied country," and that the opposition, in continuing its activity, was taking "tremendous risks." And it cannot be overemphasized that we are making the same mistake about Soviet Russia today.

Anybody's Guess

The Living Lincoln: The Man, His Mind, His Times and the War He Fought, Reconstructed from His Own Writings. Edited by Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers. 673 pp. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. $6.95

After all that has been written about him, the character of Lincoln remains an enigma wrapped in a mystery. The immense volume of partisan biography makes it risky to consult secondary sources, and the student who wishes a true picture is practically obliged to go to the man's own writings. From *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln,* recently issued by the Rutgers University Press, Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers have prepared this selection, ranging from Lincoln's first political announcement to the voters of Sangamon County in 1832 to his final documents envisaging the problems of Reconstruction.

One clue to "the man," perhaps, is his sense of style. From early maturity Lincoln possessed an extraordinary insight into the nuclear meanings of words. His mind was precise, logical and aristocratic; he had no patience with forms of pretentiousness like verbiage, and legal opponents dreaded his succinctness in argument. Nor was this style confined to official utterances; little gems like his suggestions to young men considering the study of law and the letters of advice he wrote to his ne'er-do-well stepbrother, John D. Johnston, are in the same vein.

A book such as this enables the reader to form his own opinion upon questions which can hardly be answered with any sureness. Was Lincoln a plain, homespun citizen who yielded to an imperative call to save the nation, or was he secretly ambitious? More than one of his close associates in Springfield believed that he was highly ambitious. And it certainly appears here that when Lincoln went after office, he left nothing practical undone to win it, and that his mind fed on politics.

Was he always a perfectly frank, open, guileless person who deserved the sobriquet, "Honest Abe"? The answer may depend on how one reads him. Some of his utterances show a surface of complete candor and simplicity while possessing an inner deviousness that leaves one puzzled as to his intentions. His genius at language enabled him invariably to stop short of the politically fatal commitment.

Did Lincoln really hope to avert civil war? It is a standard schoolbook proposition that he did. But there is evidence here that as early as the Kentucky elections of 1849, in which every anti-slavery candidate was defeated, he gave up hope for a non-violent settlement of the slavery controversy. His handling of the Fort Sumter incident also supports the latter view.

Lincoln was by nature a moral philosopher, and he had a sense of the tragic that sets him off sharply from the optimists, strenuous extroverts, and believers in Progress who seem the only political timber available today. A half poetic pessimism accompanied him through life. Once after witnessing the cheerful, carefree behavior of some slaves who were being sold down the river, he observed that life leaves the worst of human conditions tolerable and the best little more than tolerable.

The commentaries of the editors are too much in the tradition of hero-building. But the selections themselves show one of the most complex minds ever produced by this country; and the reader may cease to wonder why Lincoln has been claimed with equal zeal by radicals, liberals and conservatives.

RICHARD M. WEAVER

Still Needed

The Soviet Impact on Society, by Dagobert D. Runes. 202 pp. New York: Philosophical Library. $3.75

Dagobert Runes was able to see in 1938 (when he wrote this book, but did not find a publisher) what it has taken many of his fellow writers much longer to discover: the theoretical fallacies of Marxian Socialism, the inhumanity of Soviet Communism. It might have accomplished more then than now, but it is still needed. For many of the same people who fell for the United Front "pitch" twenty years ago are compounding their error, and are still leading their double-standard Liberal students into the same folly.

Runes' little book contains an excellent critical analysis of Marxian doctrine, of the political structure of the Soviet Union, and of the attempt to export Communism to other countries. Unhappily, Harry Elmer Barnes was invited to write the introduction, and pats himself on the back because he has "been able to maintain some objectivity and composure on the Russian problem," which he describes as that of a "challenging economic system." "It will take something more than the current Cold War," he boasts, "to move me from an understanding attitude into passionate diatribe." He proceeds with a note of nonsense about the Allied Powers intervening in Russia after the first World War, a Frederick Schuman-like description of Soviet foreign policy in the 1930's, and a Vera M. Dean explanation of the beginnings of the Cold War in 1947.

It is, therefore, all the more pleasant to find the author calling a spade a spade when it comes to Communism. The best sections of the book are those exposing the fallacies of the Marxian doctrine of surplus value, the chapter comparing Communism and Fascism, and the chapters dealing with Soviet foreign policy. He shows time and time again how "liberals," "progres-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sives," and Socialists claiming to be concerned about humanity, espoused inhumanity because of their inability to comprehend Communism. Speaking of the Hungarian Social Democrats of 1918 the author comments: "Like most of the socialists of other countries, they imagined socialism to be a form of liberal, progressive philosophy. They still thought with Bernstein that socialism is the outcome of liberalism." Speaking of Russia in the middle thirties, he writes: "When the editorial writers of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* go into eulogies over the Marxist constitution, we know that they are literati in the pay of Stalin's dictatorship; but why should some of our American writers deliberately lie concerning this about-face of Russia's trend towards democracy? Is Comrade Stalin's 'writers' fund' larger than we thought?"

"One can easily imagine," he concludes, "what damage Stalinist organizations could do to our country in a crisis. It is high time to take steps to protect the American citizen from having to face an enemy in his own ranks in time of war; to protect our working men from being organized into groups of units, subject to party discipline, and obedient to the edicts of a foreign dictator; and to secure our citizens against having their property destroyed and their premises forcefully occupied by reckless agitators."

ANTHONY T. BOUSCAREN

Menacing Winds

Keep the Aspidistra Flying, by George Orwell. 248 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $3.75

We Americans are living, a Senator claimed the other day in a burst of political exuberance, under a regime of "mass happiness." If so, we should find this book, which first appeared in England in 1936 and was just recently published in America, more disturbing than a touch of nostalgia. Our aspidistras are alive and green, if not in English windows, then in the modern planter boxes that divide so many American living rooms from dinettes.

This common, sturdy house plant, Orwell's symbol of the middle class, is still flying and all is well — or is it? In any case, reading the book is strangely like walking over a grave.

Let us go back with Orwell to England of the mid-thirties and hear him tell the story of a pathetic, frustrated and often contemptible young man named Gordon Comstock. And let us forget — if we can — the dreadful prescience with which Orwell brought the "menacing winds" of *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* to hurricane force some thirteen years later in his frightening and final novel *1984*.

Like some miserable little bug, Gordon Comstock writhes painfully on the point of Orwell's satirical pen. Reared in middle-class poverty and respectability, which he despises, he tries to write poetry. Work, except in dingy little bookstores, is an alternative not to be considered, because it would represent surrender to the hated "money world" against which he has taken his "stand."

He is not a Socialist, despite the careless remark of one of his countrymen that "we're all Socialists nowadays." He spurns Marx and refuses to accept the popular Socialism. But a money phobia is deeply embedded in his mixed-up mind and causes him to loathe money and desire it with an unbearable passion. Money colors everything he does, everything he thinks, frustrating him even in his love life; for who can make love successfully with only eightpence in his pocket?

Gordon's fierce hatred for the commercialism of the garish advertising posters, which scream the virtues of Bovex, Q. T. Sauce and Breakfast Crisps, is easy to sympathize with. We in our own era of mass happiness and television sets cannot escape the constant shrillness of Twenty Thousand Filters and Dishwashing That Is Almost Nice.

But our sympathy turns to contempt as he deliberately pushes himself lower and lower down the social and economic scale, stubbornly refusing good jobs, cadging from his hard-working sister and tormenting his patient, understanding sweetheart, the while carping about his lack of money and fiddling with his wretched little poems in his cold, dirty little bedroom.

There is a particularly sordid and discouraging climax during which hope vanishes entirely, but then Mr. Orwell, falling back on that old standby biology, comes to the rescue. All ends well, and so is well.

In Gordon Comstock, Mr. Orwell presumably wished to show the weaknesses, the confusions, the susceptibility, and the dangers — the "menacing winds" — of the middle class, and, along with them, the strength and virtues of that class.

I would feel quite comfortable and satisfied with *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* — if I could forget the past twenty years and if Orwell had not written *1984*. I would feel reassured as to the indestructibility of the great middle class which, in the clinches, faces up to its responsibilities. At least in 1936 its sturdy virtues, like the aspidistra, were still flying. It would be nice to leave it at that.

But I can't help wondering what George Orwell, if he were still alive, would say now.

FRANCES BECK

Successful Experiment

Thoreau: Voice in the Edgeland, by Langley Carleton Keyes. 131 pp. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press. $2.50

It would seem *a priori* that sonnets by a poetic necessity inherent in their metrical form must be unities of thought and feeling, independent of one another, except, of course, when fifteen sonnets constitute a Voloshinian cycle. But Blunt's *Esther* is an excellent narrative poem, and now Mr. Keyes uses sonnets as stanzas in which he paraphrases and interprets the thought of Thoreau. The experiment is singularly successful. This is one of the most pleasing poems written in America in recent decades.

R.P.O.

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:
THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.
Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: .....
(name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....
(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the Editor

Don't Compromise

For a time there I was wondering whether NATIONAL REVIEW's editorial policy was really effective. I was inclined to suggest that your magazine carry articles that would furnish conservatives with polemical "ammunition" written in a straight factual style. . . .

However, after reading a recent piece from . . . [the Liberal press] I no longer insist that you compromise. . . . The issues you raise have been greeted by oceans of silence on the part of left-wing commentators and the questions you pose ignored by the editors of the Liberal journals. . . .

New York City WILLIAM E. TRAINER

Desegregation

I wish to commend you and your staff for your fair and impartial reporting concerning, in particular, the South's stand on segregation. . . . *Look, Life, Time,* etc., are very *hostile* toward Dixie. . . . If we could only get them to aim their animosity and ill feelings and prejudice at the Russians!

. . . even though you do not like segregation itself, you can see our side of the matter—and also agree with us, in that the U.S. Supreme Court *can* be wrong—it is *not* "above reproach."

Tallahassee, Fla. EDGAR S. ANDERSON

The Bricker Amendment

I must take exception to the views expressed by James Burnham [April 4] . . . that the new Bricker Amendment answers the problem. The elimination of the controversial "which" clause, or some similar substitute, makes the new amendment mere useless rhetoric. The disregard of the present United States Supreme Court for both the precedent of prior cases and the text of the Constitution, makes it clear that only the most explicit language in an amendment affecting the treaty power can be expected to have the slightest influence upon the decisions of the Court.

My analysis of the new Bricker Amendment is this: Senator Bricker and President Eisenhower have made a deal which will extricate the Republican Party from an impossible situation. Senator Bricker will have his cake (the new amendment), and President Eisenhower will eat it (his treaty powers will be absolutely unaffected). In this way the Republican Party will retain the support of those voters who might otherwise have been disaffected from the Party in view of the President's opposition to the old Bricker Amendment. Senator Bricker's retreat from the original text of his amendment is motivated by partisan reasons, and is a deliberate, callous and cynical betrayal of principle.

Harrisburg, Pa. ANDREW WILSON GREEN

(We remind Mr. Green that Mr. Burnham did recommend the inclusion of the following clause, or one like it, in the Bricker Amendment: "*No action by an international body shall of itself have the force of domestic law within the United States.*" EDITORS)

Drew Blanks

My NATIONAL REVIEW of March 14 had five blank pages—very much easier to read than much of your stuff, but I'd rather read what you write. . . .

Fort Pierce, Fla. FLETCHER A. RUSSELL

"Intramural Donnybrooks"

. . . It would appear that Mr. Meyer ["In Defense of John Stuart Mill," March 28] is upset because he finds himself in contention with Mr. Kirk in regard to the exact position of Mill. He is particularly irked at the idea that anyone should think of restricting the freedom of man. . . .

He must know that society, as it is constituted, is not and could not be composed of individuals, like snowflakes, rattling off in all directions at once. . . .There are standards of right conduct . . . and while one need not pound individuals into conformity with moral laws, there is a force in society which may be called censorship, or community, or good-will, or public opinion, which will and should seek to put certain restraints on liberty. . . . Conservatives believe that there is a necessity for order and prejudice and prescribed rights, as well as privileges. . . .

Meanwhile, why wouldn't it be a good idea for NATIONAL REVIEW to spare us from intramural donnybrooks between those who split hairs? . . . It would be a shame if one day we awakened to discover that while we had been beating at each other, our real enemies had taken over. Then, indeed, we should have neither permission nor ability to redirect our forces, or resecure a proper freedom.

St. Petersburg, Fla. DR. ROBERT NEEDLES

Eisenhower Decision

Mr. Buckley's attack on the Eisenhower Administration [March 31] sickened me. . . . It is a tragedy that the Mr. Buckleys constantly assume that Robert Taft represents their point of view. How blind these self-styled "Taft Republicans" are. . . . Robert Taft would be working *with the President* — both BIG men respecting, honoring and relying upon one another.

Seattle, Wash. MRS. MARK COLLARINO

You conclude "Mr. Eisenhower's Decision" with the observation that he is a good man. . . . You continue, "The Eisenhower program is not administered by traitors or adventurers or political evangelists or even cynics." It is difficult to understand how you arrived at this conclusion when they are carrying out the same program as that of Roosevelt and Truman. . . .

It would not make a bit of difference if Adlai Stevenson were elected. Although [I am] a Republican, I think his election would be preferable. As President, Stevenson would meet with the opposition that is now lacking. The Democrats cannot oppose Eisenhower since he is carrying out their program, and the Republicans . . . will not.

Forest Hills, N.Y. R. BRADY

"More, More!"

My only criticism of NATIONAL REVIEW is that there is not enough of it. I read it from cover to cover, and then cry out, like Oliver Twist, for "More, more!" It is a constant wonder to me that you have achieved the editorial prodigy of assembling so pungent, literate and authoritative a staff of contributors. As an amateur of criticism, I take particular joy in Mr. Schlamm's column, "Arts and Manners," which seems to strike a new dimension in esthetic discussions. . . .

New York City RICHARD L. STOKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

....it is good for Man

to enjoy the fruits of industrial progress

Man's progress has been ever upwards. In each succeeding phase of his evolution, he discovered new elements, developed new ideas, made things he had never made before, and made them better and faster. With the advent of steel, for example, man ushered in an age of mass production, communications, and the highest standard of living he had ever before enjoyed.

But the "Age of Steel" could not have reached its peak without the aid of Kennametal,* because this hard, strong metal of tungsten and other rare minerals has tripled the speed of machining even the hardest, toughest steel alloys. This innovation has meant increased rates of machine productivity, much longer tool life, with less machine down time for tool changing or sharpening.

Today, Kennametal is fabricated into varieties of tools for use in hundreds of applications in the metalworking, mining, and woodworking industries, and into all types of wear parts for machines and process equipment. These useful Kennametal items have contributed billions of dollars to the nation's economy in the form of greater productivity and lower costs, although Kennametal was invented a scant twenty years ago. Similar contributions in the future will run to additional billions. KENNAMETAL INC., Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

In the absence of a Gold Standard during the past two decades, the great savings made possible by Kennametal have evaporated in helping hold down the rate of inflation. Thus, you and your fellow men have not been able to enjoy "the fruits" of industrial ingenuity in the form of lower prices. Perhaps this suggests the need for the re-establishment of a Gold Coin Standard. At least, it is a subject for serious discussion with friends, neighbors, public officials and candidates for office, particularly since this is an election year.

*Kennametal is the Registered Trademark of a series of hard carbide alloys of tungsten, tungsten-titanium and tantalum carbide, for tooling in the metalworking, mining, woodworking, textile and petroleum industries, and for wear parts in machines and processing equipment.

B-5920

One of a series of advertisements in the public interest

INDUSTRY AND
KENNAMETAL
... Partners in Progress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Pick the Candidates!" Contest

To name the candidates for President and Vice President who will be chosen by the two major party conventions



10 Prizes 10

FIRST PRIZE: A $1,500 credit toward a vacation of your choice

SECOND PRIZE: A large-screen color television set

EIGHT ADDITIONAL PRIZES: Each prize a $50 certificate for either books or phonograph records of your choice



Contest Rules

1. Any resident of the United States above eighteen years of age may enter (except employees of NATIONAL REVIEW and their families).
2. To enter the contest, each contestant must fill out four official entry blanks (or facsimiles) with predictions as follows:
   a) The 1956 Republican nominees for President and Vice President
   b) The 1956 Democratic nominees for President and Vice President
   c) The number of first ballot votes for the Republican Presidential nominee
   d) The number of first ballot votes for the Democratic Presidential nominee
3. Beginning with the March 7 issue, NATIONAL REVIEW is publishing one entry blank each week for twenty successive weeks. These blanks will be numbered as follows: A1, A2, A3, A4; B1, B2, B3, B4; C1, C2, C3, C4; D1, D2, D3, D4; E1, E2, E3, E4.
4. Each contestant must fill out the four complete blanks of one set (i.e., the "A" set, "B" set, etc.), and must send in all four at one time, in one envelope. Each contestant may send in one entry of each set — five possible entries in all. (It is not necessary to buy NATIONAL REVIEW in order to enter. You may apply for entry blanks at NATIONAL REVIEW'S office at 211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.; but, to facilitate handling, only one blank can be supplied on each application.)
5. The contest will close on August 1, 1956. All entries must be postmarked not later than 11 P.M. on that date. Winners will be notified on or before September 15, 1956.
6. All entries must be addressed to: "Pick the Candidates!" Room 202, 211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.
7. The standing of the contestants will be determined by the number of candidates correctly named, with ties decided by the relative accuracy of the first ballot estimates. If ties still remain, tie-breaking questions will be assigned.
8. The editors of NATIONAL REVIEW will act as judges. Their decision on all matters will be final.
9. Entries to this contest will not be accepted from states where prize contests are prohibited by state or local law.

Official Entry Blank B-3

"Pick the Candidates!" Contest

When properly filled out and submitted together with completed entry blanks B-1, B-2 and B-4, this will constitute an official entry to NATIONAL REVIEW's "Pick the Candidates!" contest, subject to the contest rules. Address your entry to "Pick the Candidates!" Room 202, 211 East 37th St., New York 16, N. Y.

I predict that the number of first ballot votes for the Presidential nominee at the 1956 Republican Convention will be:

_____

_____

My Name

_____

Address

_____

City Zone State

(The editors of NATIONAL REVIEW request the following information, which is not, however, an entry requirement for the contest.)

I suggest that the following might be interested in NATIONAL REVIEW:

_____

Name

_____

Address

_____

City Zone State

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED